UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,905	01/25/2006	Kohei Yamaguchi	2005-2010A	7348

52349   7590   05/12/2010
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.
1030 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER
HANCE, ROBERT J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2421	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/12/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
eoa@wenderoth.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 January 2010*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,9-11,15 and 16* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-7,9-11,15 and 16* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

1/27/2010 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to

non-statutory subject matter. Claim 16 is directed toward a computer-readable

recording medium having recorded thereon a program. However, the specification is

silent regarding the composition of the claimed computer-readable recording medium.

According to the USPTO memo *Subject Matter Eligibility of Computer Readable Media*

of 26 January 2010, absent an explicit disclosure that a claimed computer-readable

medium consists of <u>only</u> statutory matter, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the

claim includes a signal, which is non-statutory. To claim a "non-transitory computer-

readable storage medium" would overcome this rejection. Please note that claiming a

"storage medium" does not render the claim statutory as a signal can store, temporarily,

a computer program.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kwoh et al., US Patent No 6,115,057 in view of Conkwright et al., US

Pub No. 2002/0133490 in view of Juneau, US Pub No. 2005/0108529 and further in

view of Leung et al., US Pub No. 2002/0095673.

        As to claim 1 Kwoh et al. disclose a broadcast receiving terminal which receives

a broadcast wave and displays broadcast contents (Fig. 1: 43, 45),

        wherein the broadcast wave includes stream information indicating broadcast

contents, and outline information indicating an outline of the broadcast contents (Fig.

23: 666, 667; col. 11 lines 13-21; col. 15 line 53 – col. 16 line 6), and

said broadcast receiving terminal comprises: a receiving unit operable to receive the broadcast wave (Fig. 1: 43);

a display unit operable to display the broadcast contents (Fig. 1: 45);

a judging unit operable to judge, based on a user's operation, whether or not the broadcast contents should be displayed (Fig. 1: 40; col. 11 lines 59-64);

a display control unit operable to perform image processing on the stream information of the broadcast wave received by said receiving unit, and to cause said display unit to display the broadcast contents, when said judging unit judges that the broadcast contents should be displayed (Fig. 1; col. 10 lines 58-66); and

an outline presentation unit operable to present the outline, so that the outline synchronizes with the broadcast contents, which is indicated by the outline information transmitted by the broadcast wave received by said receiving unit, when said judging unit judges that the broadcast contents should not be displayed (col. 1 line 60 – col. 2 line 5; Figs. 32a-32d).

a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a predetermined function based on a user's operation (Figs. 7-11),

wherein said judging unit is operable to:

judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed, when the predetermined function is activated, and to judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed, when the predetermined function is terminated (Kwoh Fig. 11; col. 15 line 53 – col. 16 line 29; user is given the option to enable and disable the blocking function), and

wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the predetermined function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image generated by the predetermined function instead of the broadcast contents (Figs. 32a-32d - when the blocking function is enabled (i.e. the predetermined function has been activated), an outline is displayed in place of the broadcast content. This outline is an "function processing image" since it is an image indicating to the user that the blocking function is processing).

Kwoh fails to disclose that the predetermined function is one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a camera function.

However, in an analogous art, Juneau discloses a parental controls application which is a JAVA application function ([0054]; [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Kwoh with the teachings of Juneau, the rationale being to enable the system to function in a set top box which uses JAVA applications.

The combined system of Kwoh and Juneau fails to disclose wherein the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment of said judging unit, and wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, prevent said function processing unit from activating the predetermined function based on the user's operation and judge that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag

is received by said receiving unit; and that the judgment of whether or not to display the

broadcast contents occurs before the limit flag is received or after the release flag is

received.

However, in an analogous art, Conkwright discloses receiving a limit flag which

limits the control of a display device ([0290]-[0292] – SureView advertisements are a

limit flag which force a user to view an advertisement), and wherein a judging unit is

operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit

displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents should be continuously

displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received regardless

of a user's operation ([0290]-[0292] – a user is unable to change channels during a

SureView advertisement); a broadcast wave that includes a release flag which releases

the limitations on the judgment of a set top box; and that the stream information is

continuously displayed until the release flag is received by said receiving unit ([0290]-

[0292] – during a "SureView" advertisement, a user is unable to change channels.

When the advertisement finishes, the channel can be changed. Therefore, the end of a

"SureView" advertisement is a release flag which releases the limitations on the

judgment of the set top box. Because a user is forced to view the SureView

advertisement, in the combined system, the system will be unable to activate the

predetermined function during the SureView advertisement).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh and Juneau with the teachings of

Conkwright, the rationale being to allow users to regain control of their set top box once

a forced advertisement finishes. In this combined system, the contents are blocked when the blocking function is enabled (i.e. a predetermined function is activated), and the contents are displayed when this function is disabled. The system functions in this manner before a forced advertisement (limit flag) is received and after the release flag is received (i.e. after the advertisement finishes).

The combined system of Kwoh, Juneau and Conkwright fails to disclose that the function processing image is displayed while the outline is displayed so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, and that the function processing image is different from the outline.

However, in an analogous art, Leung discloses a parental controls function processing image that is not an outline and is displayed when a predetermined parental control function is activated (Fig. 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau and Conkwright with the teachings of Leung by displaying a function processing image, such as that disclosed by Leung, alongside the plot outline disclosed by Kwoh. The rationale for this modification would have been to inform viewers that the scene is blocked as a result of parental controls, while providing the outline of Kwoh.

As to claim 3 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung disclose the broadcast receiving terminal according to claim 1, wherein said outline

presentation unit is operable to cause said display unit to display the outline as a

character string (Kwoh Figs. 32a-32d).

As to claim 4 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung

disclose the broadcast receiving terminal according to claim 3, wherein said display unit

has a first display area, and a second display area smaller than the first display area,

said display control unit is operable to display the broadcast contents in the first display

area, and said outline presentation unit is operable to display the outline in the second

display area (Kwoh Figs. 32a-32d – first display area is the entire television screen, and

second display area, smaller than the first display area, is the area in which the text is

displayed).

As to claim 5 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung

disclose the broadcast receiving terminal according to claim 1, wherein said outline

presentation unit is operable to notify the user of the outline indicated by the outline

information with a voice (Kwoh col. 16 lines 30-34).

As to claim 9 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung

disclose the broadcast receiving terminal according to claim 1, further comprising a

reception unit operable to receive an instruction to display/not display the broadcast

contents, based on the user's operation (Kwoh Fig. 1: 32; 40; Fig. 11; col. 15 line 53 –

col. 16 line 29; user is given the option to enable and disable the blocking function),

wherein said judging unit is operable to judge that the broadcast contents should be

displayed, when an instruction to display is received by said reception unit, and

operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed, when an

instruction not to display is received by said reception unit (Kwoh col. 3 line 53 – col. 4

line 24: parental control circuitry is controlled by user input; col. 11 lines 59-64).

      As to claim 15 Kwoh et al. disclose a broadcast receiving method of receiving a

broadcast wave and displaying broadcast contents (Fig. 1: 43, 45),

      wherein the broadcast wave includes stream information indicating broadcast

contents, and outline information indicating an outline of the broadcast contents (Fig.

23: 666, 667; col. 11 lines 13-21; col. 15 line 53 – col. 16 line 6), and

      wherein said broadcast receiving method comprises: a receiving step of receiving

the broadcast wave (Fig. 1: 43);

      a judging step of judging whether or not the broadcast contents should be

displayed based on a user's operation (Fig. 1: 40; col. 11 lines 59-64);

      a display unit operable to display the broadcast contents (Fig. 1: 45);

      a display control step of executing an image processing on the stream

information of the broadcast wave received in said receiving step and causing said

broadcast contents to be displayed on a display unit, when it is judged, in said judging

step, that the broadcast contents should be displayed (Fig. 1; col. 10 lines 58-66); and

      an outline presentation step of presenting the outline, which is indicated by the

outline information received in said receiving step, so that the outline synchronizes with

the broadcast contents, when it is judged, in said judging step, that the broadcast

contents should not be displayed (col. 1 line 60 – col. 2 line 5; Figs. 32a-32d), and

      a function processing step of activating and terminating a predetermined function

based on a user's operation (Figs. 7-11),

wherein in said judging step:

when the predetermined function is activated, it is judged that the broadcast contents should not be displayed, and when the predetermined function is terminated, it is judged that the broadcast contents should be displayed (Kwoh Fig. 11; col. 15 line 53 – col. 16 line 29; user is given the option to enable and disable the blocking function), and

wherein in said function processing step, when the predetermined function has been activated, said display unit is caused to display a function processing image generated by the predetermined function instead of the broadcast contents (Figs. 32a-32d - when the blocking function is enabled (i.e. the predetermined function has been activated), an outline is displayed in place of the broadcast content. This outline is an "function processing image" since it is an image indicating to the user that the blocking function is processing).

Kwoh fails to disclose that the predetermined function is one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a camera function.

However, in an analogous art, Juneau discloses a parental controls application which is a JAVA application function ([0054]; [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Kwoh with the teachings of Juneau, the rationale being to enable the system to function in a set top box which uses JAVA applications.

The combined system of Kwoh and Juneau fails to disclose wherein the broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment of said judging unit, and wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, prevent said function processing unit from activating the predetermined function based on the user's operation and judge that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received by said receiving unit; and that the judgment of whether or not to display the broadcast contents occurs before the limit flag is received or after the release flag is received.

However, in an analogous art, Conkwright discloses receiving a limit flag which limits the control of a display device ([0290]-[0292] – SureView advertisements are a limit flag which force a user to view an advertisement), and wherein a judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received regardless of a user's operation ([0290]-[0292] – a user is unable to change channels during a SureView advertisement); a broadcast wave that includes a release flag which releases the limitations on the judgment of a set top box; and that the stream information is continuously displayed until the release flag is received by said receiving unit ([0290]-[0292] – during a "SureView" advertisement, a user is unable to change channels. When the advertisement finishes, the channel can be changed. Therefore, the end of a

"SureView" advertisement is a release flag which releases the limitations on the judgment of the set top box. Because a user is <u>forced</u> to view the SureView advertisement, in the combined system, the system will be unable to activate the predetermined function during the SureView advertisement).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh and Juneau with the teachings of Conkwright, the rationale being to allow users to regain control of their set top box once a forced advertisement finishes. In this combined system, the contents are blocked when the blocking function is enabled (i.e. a predetermined function is activated), and the contents are displayed when this function is disabled. The system functions in this manner before a forced advertisement (limit flag) is received and after the release flag is received (i.e. after the advertisement finishes).

The combined system of Kwoh, Juneau and Conkwright fails to disclose that the function processing image is displayed while the outline is displayed so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, and that the function processing image is different from the outline.

However, in an analogous art, Leung discloses a parental controls function processing image that is not an outline and is displayed when a predetermined parental control function is activated (Fig. 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau and Conkwright with the

teachings of Leung by displaying a function processing image, such as that disclosed by Leung, alongside the plot outline disclosed by Kwoh. The rationale for this modification would have been to inform viewers that the scene is blocked as a result of parental controls, while providing the outline of Kwoh.

As to claim 16 Kwoh et al. disclose a program recorded on a computer-readable recording medium, for receiving a broadcast wave and displaying broadcast contents (Fig. 1: 43, 45),

wherein the broadcast wave includes stream information indicating broadcast contents, and outline information indicating an outline of the broadcast contents (Fig. 23: 666, 667; col. 11 lines 13-21; col. 15 line 53 – col. 16 line 6), and

wherein said broadcast receiving method comprises: a receiving step of receiving the broadcast wave (Fig. 1: 43);

a judging step of judging whether or not the broadcast contents should be displayed based on a user's operation (Fig. 1: 40; col. 11 lines 59-64);

a display unit operable to display the broadcast contents (Fig. 1: 45);

a display control step of executing an image processing on the stream information of the broadcast wave received in said receiving step and causing said broadcast contents to be displayed on a display unit, when it is judged, in said judging step, that the broadcast contents should be displayed (Fig. 1; col. 10 lines 58-66); and

an outline presentation step of presenting the outline, which is indicated by the outline information received in said receiving step, so that the outline synchronizes with

the broadcast contents, when it is judged, in said judging step, that the broadcast

contents should not be displayed (col. 1 line 60 – col. 2 line 5; Figs. 32a-32d), and

a function processing step of activating and terminating a predetermined function

based on a user's operation (Figs. 7-11),

wherein in said judging step:

when the predetermined function is activated, it is judged that the broadcast

contents should not be displayed, and when the predetermined function is terminated, it

is judged that the broadcast contents should be displayed (Kwoh Fig. 11; col. 15 line 53

– col. 16 line 29; user is given the option to enable and disable the blocking function),

and

wherein in said function processing step, when the predetermined function has

been activated, said display unit is caused to display a function processing image

generated by the predetermined function instead of the broadcast contents (Figs. 32a-

32d - when the blocking function is enabled (i.e. the predetermined function has been

activated), an outline is displayed in place of the broadcast content. This outline is an

"function processing image" since it is an image indicating to the user that the blocking

function is processing).

Kwoh fails to disclose that the predetermined function is one of an e-mail

function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a

camera function.

However, in an analogous art, Juneau discloses a parental controls application

which is a JAVA application function ([0054]; [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Kwoh with the teachings of Juneau, the rationale

being to enable the system to function in a set top box which uses JAVA applications.

The combined system of Kwoh and Juneau fails to disclose wherein the

broadcast wave includes a limit flag which limits judgment of said judging unit, and

wherein said judging unit is operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit

flag while said display unit displays the broadcast contents, prevent said function

processing unit from activating the predetermined function based on the user's

operation and judge that the broadcast contents indicated by the stream information

should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag

is received by said receiving unit; and that the judgment of whether or not to display the

broadcast contents occurs before the limit flag is received or after the release flag is

received.

However, in an analogous art, Conkwright discloses receiving a limit flag which

limits the control of a display device ([0290]-[0292] – SureView advertisements are a

limit flag which force a user to view an advertisement), and wherein a judging unit is

operable to judge, when said receiving unit receives the limit flag while said display unit

displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents should be continuously

displayed after the reception of the limit flag until the release flag is received regardless

of a user's operation ([0290]-[0292] – a user is unable to change channels during a

SureView advertisement); a broadcast wave that includes a release flag which releases

the limitations on the judgment of a set top box; and that the stream information is

continuously displayed until the release flag is received by said receiving unit ([0290]-

[0292] – during a "SureView" advertisement, a user is unable to change channels.

When the advertisement finishes, the channel can be changed. Therefore, the end of a

"SureView" advertisement is a release flag which releases the limitations on the

judgment of the set top box. Because a user is <u>forced</u> to view the SureView

advertisement, in the combined system, the system will be unable to activate the

predetermined function during the SureView advertisement).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh and Juneau with the teachings of

Conkwright, the rationale being to allow users to regain control of their set top box once

a forced advertisement finishes. In this combined system, the contents are blocked

when the blocking function is enabled (i.e. a predetermined function is activated), and

the contents are displayed when this function is disabled. The system functions in this

manner before a forced advertisement (limit flag) is received and after the release flag is

received (i.e. after the advertisement finishes).

The combined system of Kwoh, Juneau and Conkwright fails to disclose that the

function processing image is displayed while the outline is displayed so that the

presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are

performed simultaneously, and that the function processing image is different from the

outline.

However, in an analogous art, Leung discloses a parental controls function

processing image that is not an outline and is displayed when a predetermined parental

control function is activated (Fig. 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau and Conkwright with the

teachings of Leung by displaying a function processing image, such as that disclosed by

Leung, alongside the plot outline disclosed by Kwoh. The rationale for this modification

would have been to inform viewers that the scene is blocked as a result of parental

controls, while providing the outline of Kwoh.

3.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh,

Juneau, Conkwright and Leung as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view

of Tsukagoshi, US Patent No 5,684,542.

As to claim 6 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung fail

to disclose that the outline information includes time information indicating the time

when the outline should be presented, and said outline presentation unit is operable to

present the outline when the present time matches the time indicated by the time

information.

However, in an analogous art, Tsukagoshi discloses including time information

with text information which is to be displayed along with broadcast content (col. 11 line

65 - col. 12 line 16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung with

the teachings of Tsukagoshi. The rationale for this combination would have been to

synchronize text and broadcast data when the broadcast is digital, and thus embedding

the text in the VBI is not possible. In this situation, including time information with the

text would be necessary for the system of Kwoh et al. to work.

4.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh,

Juneau, Conkwright and Leung as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of

Palmer, US Patent No 5,195,135.

As to claim 7 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung fail

to disclose the broadcast receiving terminal according to claim 1, wherein said outline

presentation unit is further operable to perform image processing on the stream

information of the broadcast wave received by said receiving unit, and to cause said

display unit to display a moving picture with a lower image quality than the broadcast

contents displayed by said display control unit, when said judging unit judges that

broadcast contents should not be displayed.

However, in an analogous art, Palmer discloses censoring a video image by

displaying the image with a lower image quality when it is decided that censorship is

desired (col. 3 lines 3-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung with

the teachings of Palmer. The motivation for this combination would have been to create

a more visually pleasing censoring technique (see Palmer Abstract).

5.   Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view

of Lee et al., US Pub No 2001/0049296.

As to claim 10 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung

fail to disclose the broadcast receiving terminal according to claim 1, wherein said

broadcast receiving terminal is configured in first and second forms, which can be

switched between in accordance with a user's operation; and said judging unit is

operable to judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed, when said broadcast

receiving terminal is in the first form, and to judge that the broadcast contents should

not be displayed, when said broadcast receiving terminal is in the second form.

However, in an analogous art, Lee et al. disclose a receiving terminal that is

configured in two forms, where the information displayed on the terminal changes when

the user changes the form of the terminal (Abstract, Fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung with

the teachings of Lee et al. to display the text summary of the broadcast when the

terminal is in a first form, and to display the full video of the broadcast when the terminal

is in a second form. The rationale for this combination would have been to allow a user

to follow a broadcast program regardless of whether the terminal is in an open or closed

state.

As to claim 11 the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung

fail to disclose the broadcast receiving terminal according to claim 10, wherein said

display unit includes a first display unit, which appears on the surface when said

broadcast receiving terminal is in the first form, and a second display unit, which

appears on the surface when said broadcast receiving terminal is in the second form,

said display control unit is operable to cause said first display unit to display the

broadcast contents, and said outline presentation unit is operable to cause said second

display unit to display the outline.

However, in an analogous art, Lee et al. disclose a device which has a first

display unit which appears on the surface when the device is in a first form and a

second display unit which appears on the surface when the device is in a second form

(Fig. 3C: 30a and 30b), and the information displayed on the display devices depends

on the form of the device (Fig. 6; Abstract); and a receiving terminal that is configured in

two forms, where the information displayed on the terminal changes when the user

changes the form of the terminal (Abstract, Fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combined system of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung with

the teachings of Lee et al. to display the text summary of the broadcast when the

terminal is in a first form, and to display the full video of the broadcast when the terminal

is in a second form. The rationale for this combination would have been to allow a user

to follow a broadcast program regardless of whether the terminal is in an open or closed

state.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ROBERT HANCE whose telephone number is

(571)270-5319. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/   ROBERT HANCE

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421   Examiner
                                                    Art Unit 2421

/ROBERT HANCE/
Examiner, Art Unit 2421